

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15, 18 and 20 have been amended. Claim 15 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 12, 18 and 20 may be found in the original specification at, for example, paragraph [0099]. No new matter has been added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Shikhman and Examiner Wu at the interview held October 25, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3 and 14 contain allowable subject matter.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 15 and 16 were objected to because claim 15 recited "line line." Claim 15 has been amended to correct this typographical error. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are thus respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0165785 ("Monobe").

Claims 4, 6-8 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Monobe in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0165785 ("Takahashi").

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the above rejections.

Claim 1

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an apparatus including a blob identifier, wherein the blob identifier includes a top-to-bottom module for analyzing each pixel in turn in raster scan order, as recited in claim 1.

Monobe discloses a process flow of an image processing apparatus including a DCT unit 101 that transforms a reconstructive image decoded from JPEG compressed data by the DCT. The image processing apparatus further including a specifying unit 103 that specifies a block distortion area, an edge area and a homogeneous area in the reconstructed image decoded from the JPEG compressed data. However, the pixels that are included in the block distortion area, edge area and homogeneous areas disclosed in Monobe are not analyzed from top to bottom in raster scan order as required in claim 1. In fact, the area specifying unit 103 transforms all blocks in a reconstructive image by DCT. For example, area specifying unit 103 specifies a block distortion area by identifying blocks wherein all the DCT coefficients over a specific frequency are listed at a predetermined value. That is, the pixels are analyzed according to their values and not in raster scan order as required in claim 1. As such, Monobe fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature.

Further, the Patent Office relies on Takahashi as allegedly disclosing a neighborhood of pixels including a top left adjacent pixel. However, even if Takahashi is relied on as

disclosing this feature, Takahashi fails to remedy the deficiencies of Monobe in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claim 1.

Claims 12, 18 and 20

With respect to independent claims 12, 18 and 20, each of these claims also require the analyzation of pixels in raster scan order. Thus, similar to that of claim 1, and as detailed above, neither Monobe nor Takahashi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this feature.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 12, 18 and 20, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/can

Date: November 2, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037